



Brad Mettam
07/09/99 08:06 AM

To: Lawrence Monsalud/D09/Caltrans/CAGov@DOT
CC:
Subject: CA SR 127 Risk Assessment.

----- Forwarded by Brad Mettam/D09/Caltrans/CAGov on 07/09/99 10:06 AM -----



"Barbara Byron" <Bbyron@energy.state.ca.us> on 07/06/99 12:50:24 PM

To: Brad Mettam/D09/Caltrans/CAGov
cc: Dnix@energy.state.ca.us, MPlanka@POHCQO
Subject: CA SR 127 Risk Assessment.

Dear Brad,

As you know, on June 3 staff from the Western Governors' Association (WGA) and DOE (including DOE-Headquarters, DOE-Nevada and DOE-Fernald) met in San Diego with states (CA, NV, UT, AR) to discuss routing issues regarding the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE) low-level nuclear waste (LLW) shipments to the Nevada Test Site (NTS). The large number of shipments (about 800 per year) and the possible precedent these shipments may set for routing future DOE nuclear waste shipments has raised public concern about the routes being considered.

The purpose of the June 3 meeting was to identify routing issues related to the shipment of LLW to NTS and to suggest a path forward toward resolution of these issues. As you know, controversy developed following DOE's proposal to reroute through California LLW shipments from eastern states to NTS to avoid transport through Las Vegas and over Hoover Dam. The Governors of Nevada and Arizona, as well as U.S. Senators from Nevada, have requested that DOE avoid LLW shipments over Hoover Dam and through Las Vegas. The alternative routes DOE is considering include the use of CA SR 127, and shipments through Needles, Barstow and/or Baker, California. These communities as well as the counties of San Bernardino and Inyo oppose rerouting these shipments through California. Similarly, Senators Feinstein and Boxer, as well as the Chairmen of the California Congressional Delegation (Congressmen Farr and Lewis), oppose the use of SR 127 for these shipments.

After a lengthy discussion at the June 3 meeting regarding routing issues, it was decided that California and Nevada would conduct risk analyses of CA SR 127 and NV SR 160 to provide input into future routing decisions. These risk analyses (California's analysis of CA SR 127 and Nevada's analysis of NV SR 160) would be based upon the Transportation External Coordination (TEC) Group's Routing Paper called "Routing Transportation: Discussion and Recommendations". These evaluations would be prepared in time for use and discussion at the next Western Governors' Association (WGA) WIPP Transport meeting in October in San Diego.

The California Highway Patrol does not have the capability to do a physical assessment of CA SR 127 and they suggest that either Caltrans or Inyo County would be better suited to complete such an assessment. Please see the attached message from the CHP. Caltrans' Route Concept Report on State Route 127, completed in 1997, could be used in this analysis. Would Caltrans, with input from Inyo County, be able to complete such

an analysis of CA SR 127?

The TEC routing paper is available at the following website:

www.uetc.org/tec/Routing%20Paper.PDF or we can fax it to you (20 pages).

WGA and DOE are expecting California and Nevada to have their risk assessments for CA SR 127 and NV SR 160 ready for use at the October WGA meeting. I am concerned that if California does not prepare such an analysis, only the technical information from Nevada on SR 160 will be available for routing decisions. DOE has said that unless there are any "show-stoppers" revealed in California's and Nevada's studies of CA SR 127 and NV SR 160, DOE may include both of these routes in their proposed routes for LLW shipments to NTS. DOE would spread the 800 per year shipments over a variety of routes, rather than concentrating shipments on one or two routes.

DOE said that the initial Fernald shipments to NTS, which resumed over a week ago, will use the northern route and will not impact California.

Please let me know if Caltrans would be able to complete such an evaluation of SR 127 by October. If you have any questions, I can be reached at 916-654-4976. Thank you.

Barbara

Received: from tdc-rap.energy.state.ca.us ([10.40.7.1]) by energy.state.ca.us;
Fri, 02 Jul 1999 11:10:35 -0700
Received: from door.chp.ca.gov ([168.145.1.225]) by tdc-rap.energy.state.ca.us
via smtpd (for energy.state.ca.us [10.40.7.2]) with SMTP; 2 Jul 1999 18:08:34 UT
Received: from DOCHP-Message_Server by hqd8.chp.ca.gov with Novell_GroupWise;
Fri, 02 Jul 1999 11:06:42 -0700
Message-Id: <s77c9d42.056@hqd8.chp.ca.gov>
X-Mailer: Novell GroupWise 5.5
Date: Fri, 02 Jul 1999 11:03:20 -0700
From: "Meg Planka" <POHQC0.MPlanka@chp.ca.gov>
To: <Bbyron@energy.state.ca.us>
Subject: Re: Status of the CA SR 127 Risk Assessment.
Mime-Version: 1.0
Content-Type: text/plain; charset=US-ASCII
Content-Transfer-Encoding: quoted-printable
Content-Disposition: inline

Barabara

I spoke to both Pat White and Lt. Abrames, and they both were unaware of a request to do an assessment on SR 127. The CHP does not have the capability to do any physical assessments on this roadway and this could probably be done better by Caltrans.

Meg

>>> "Barbara Byron" <Bbyron@energy.state.ca.us> 06/25/99 02:20PM >>>
Dear Meg and Pat,

What is the status of the proposed risk assessment of CA SR 127 for low-level waste shipments to the Nevada Test Site? This study was mentioned at our meeting in San Diego with WGA, other states, and DOE. It was suggested that both California (SR 127) and Nevada (SR 160) would

evaluate these routes in time for the October WGA meeting in San Diego.

We have been told that unless there are any "show-stoppers" revealed in California's and Nevada's studies of CA SR 127 or NV SR 160 in Nevada, DOE may include these routes in their shipments of low-level-waste shipments to NTS. They are proposing to spread the shipments over a variety of routes, rather than concentrating on one or two routes.

Please let me know whether the CHP is going to be able to complete this risk analysis. Thanks.--Barbara